

NEMT - RFP

Technical and Cost Proposal Summary

6 - Year

	Total Technical Proposal	Total Cost Proposal	TOTAL COMBINED SCORE	Rank	
TMS	2607.5	1200	3807.5	1st	
MTM	2680	1010	3690	2nd	MO Call Center
		986	3666	3rd	DSM Call Center
AMR Access 2 Care	2555.5	1050	3605.5	4th	
LogistiCare	2463.5	1066	3529.5	5th	
Ride Source	1915	905	2820	6th	

3 - Year

	Total Technical Proposal	Total Cost Proposal	TOTAL COMBINED SCORE	Rank	
TMS	2607.5	600	3207.5	1st	
MTM	2680	525	3205	2nd	MO Call Center
		512	3192	3rd	DSM Call Center
AMR Access 2 Care	2555.5	546	3101.5	4th	
LogistiCare	2463.5	563	3026.5	5th	
Ride Source	1915	459	2374	6th	

1 - Year

	Total Technical Proposal	Total Cost Proposal	TOTAL COMBINED SCORE	Rank	
MTM	2680	176	2856	1st	MO Call Center
		171	2851	2nd	DSM Call Center
TMS	2607.5	200	2807.5	3rd	
AMR Access 2 Care	2555.5	182	2737.5	4th	
LogistiCare	2463.5	198	2661.5	5th	
Ride Source	1915	150	2065	6th	

NEMT Brokerage: RFP MED-10-011
Cost Proposals Comparison

5.4.3 Scoring of Bidder Cost Proposals

The bid with the lowest cost will receive the full point score available (200) for the cost proposal. In order to calculate every other bidder's score, the lowest bidder's cost proposal will be divided into the corresponding value of the other bidder(s) and then multiplied by the maximum points. The formula for each is expressed as follows:

$$\text{Bidder's Cost Score} = (\text{Lowest Cost} / \text{Bidder Cost}) \times \text{Maximum Points}$$

Vendor	Year 1	Pts.	Year 2	Pts.	Year 3	Pts.	Year 4	Pts.	Year 5	Pts.	Year 6	Pts.	Total Pts.	Div. By 6
TMS Management Group, Inc.	\$ 2.14	200	\$ 2.14	200	\$ 2.14	200	\$ 2.01	200	\$ 2.01	200	\$ 2.01	200	1,200	200
LogistiCare	\$ 2.16	198	\$ 2.32	184	\$ 2.37	181	\$ 2.38	169	\$ 2.40	168	\$ 2.41	167	1,066	178
Access2Care Transportation Solutions	\$ 2.35	182	\$ 2.35	182	\$ 2.35	182	\$ 2.38	169	\$ 2.40	168	\$ 2.40	168	1,050	175
Medical Transportation Management, Inc.														
Missouri Call Center:	\$ 2.43	176	\$ 2.45	175	\$ 2.46	174	\$ 2.47	163	\$ 2.48	162	\$ 2.50	161	1,010	168
Des Moines Call Center:	\$ 2.50	171	\$ 2.51	171	\$ 2.52	170	\$ 2.53	159	\$ 2.54	158	\$ 2.55	158	986	164
RideSource	\$ 2.85	150	\$ 2.80	153	\$ 2.75	156	\$ 2.70	149	\$ 2.70	149	\$ 2.70	149	905	151

NEMT - RFP

Evaluation Team Summary Score Sheet

To be filled out by the Evaluation Team Leader and submitted to the issuing officer.

Evaluator	Ride Source (Bidder name)	Logist Case (Bidder name)	AMR/Access 2 Case (Bidder name)	TMS (Bidder name)	MTM (Bidder name)
1	310	460	430	512.5	490
2	355	502.5	570	565	502.5
3	500	500	585	480	570
4	510	546	508	600	600
5	240	455	462.5	450	517.5
TOTAL Points	1915	2463.5	2555.5	2607.5	2680

Date: 4-30-10

Team Leader Signature: 1

1.3.4 Review of Proposal Sections

1.3.4.1 Executive Summary

BIDDER:	MTM
EVALUATOR Number:	1

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 4.2.4. Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder clearly demonstrate its strengths and the key features of its proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder presented a comprehensive overview of the services being proposed?


Yes.

Has the bidder provided a summary of their strengths and identified the key features of their proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Decrease fraud & abuse; coordinate w/ public transit agencies; build effective rural networks; conduct ed, training; outreach.

Has the bidder included a summary of its project management plans?

Elg, LON, network, public transit, workforce, technology.
Case Management

Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 80	Total points 40
Evaluator's Signature 		Date 4/26/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.2 Overall Project Understanding

BIDDER:	MTM
EVALUATOR Number:	1

Evaluation Criteria: (Continuation from RFP Section 4.2.4 Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate in its own words, a clear understanding of the Department's needs?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)


Has the bidder demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements in the RFP?

Yes.

Has the bidder described how they will adjust to accommodate program changes?

~~No - does not describe.~~

pg. 32 - Policy's procedure approval process - practice to adapt to program changes.

Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 75%	Total points 37.5
Evaluator's Signature 		Date 4/26/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.3 General Requirements

BIDDER:	MTM
EVALUATOR Number:	1

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 3.2.1 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Consider the bidder's approach to internal quality assurance.

Consider the bidder's description of their NEMT tracking database.

Consider the bidder's description of their electronic billing and invoice system.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder explained their approach to Section 3.2.1 General Requirements and identified each requirement and addressed each requirement?

pg 21 - general response
Draft operations manual.

Has the bidder satisfactorily described their approach to and scope of their internal quality assurance activities?

Program Director, reports, weekly customer satisfaction surveys,
We Care line (late providers, etc), provide surveys.

Pg 26 - goals
Abandon 5%
3 min 90%

Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 75%	Total points 37.5
Evaluator's Signature	Date 4/26/10	
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature	Date	
RFP Project Director Signature	Date	

1.3.4.4 Contractor Responsibilities

BIDDER:	MTM
EVALUATOR Number:	1

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate that it has the capability to perform the service requirements?

Consider: The bidder's approach to establishment of a call center and a central business office location?

Consider: The broker's approach to development of a Network plan.

1. RFP section 3.3.2.1 NEMT: Network Providers and Individuals

Has the bidder provided a description of how they will manage the different aspects of the brokerage?

Yes - Case Mgt, QM, CSC, Technology.

Has the bidder provided the detail describing the level of staff for the Account Manager position, and the call center positions, and do the levels meet the requirements for the brokerage?

Program Director Alana Macia (CEO) for interim.

Call center - either in DSM or use existing CSC.

↳ 19 CSRS, 2 team leads

Has the bidder described how they will make the transportation arrangements for all Medicaid Members who qualify for NEMT services?

CSE Manual.

Rural coverage discussed

Has the bidder described how they will ensure the provision of necessary NEMT services by establishing a network of providers through the use of subcontracts?

Provider panel = public transit, paratransit, private, volunteer, etc.

Provider guidelines.

Outreach to public transit. LOL.

Work in bordering states.

Coordinate across departments.

Credentiaing.

Has the bidder described how they will coordinate requests and make decisions on who provides the transportation when Medicaid Members request that someone, other than a Network provider, transport them?

gas reimbursement.

Note importance of this option, esp in rural areas.

2. RFP section 3.3.2.2 Verification of Member Eligibility

Has the bidder described their process for verifying the Medicaid Member's eligibility for NEMT services?

Daily eligibility files - automated system.
CSRs understand policy inc Med Needy.

3. RFP section 3.3.2.3 Office/Telephone Call Center and Appointments Standards

Has the bidder described their staffing plan for the call center?

Yes.

Training
CSR manual

19 CSRs

2 team leads

Has the bidder described how the call center will operate?

Automated workforce management tools.

Ongoing training.

Monitor calls.

Has the bidder explained their plan to accommodate passengers who have disabilities or special health care needs?

Yes.

Continuity of care, specialized management w/ care managers.

Does the bidder explain its process to insure that a Member's pick up wait time is according to the requirements specified in the RFP?

pg. 105 Monitor pick up & drop off times.

4. RFP section 3.3.2.4 NEMT Reimbursement

Has the bidder explained its NEMT reimbursement process?

Review 100% of trips.

pg 112 - Claims processing.

Typically providers will rec payment w/in 10 days of clean claim.

All w/in 20.

5. RFP section 3.3.2.5 Member Education

Has the bidder explained their process for issuing updates to information provided to Members?

Member letter, brochure on info on website.

6. RFP section 3.3.2.6 Grievance, Complaints and State Fair Hearings System

Has the bidder described their process for providing Members a grievance and complaints process? *Yes. CSR → PM. Handled by QSC.*

*OM Comm review's process yearly.
Core Standard Accreditation*



Has the bidder explained its notice of the right to a Fair Hearing for Members and their role in representing the Department in the hearing?

Yes.

*Appeals: Fair Hearings - pg 64 - will provide Dept w/ info.
Pg 123 - Legal Counsel will assist w/ hearings.*

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 80%	Total points 320
Evaluator's Signature 		Date 4/26/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 85%	Total points 340
Evaluator's Signature 		Date 4/30/10
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.5 Corporate/Team Experience & Qualifications

BIDDER:	MTM
EVALUATOR Number:	1

Evaluation Criteria: (RFP Section 4.2.6 Tab 6)

Consider: The organization experience with similar projects

Consider: Executive level commitment and a demonstration of their commitment in previous projects

1. RFP section 4.2.6.1 Experience

Has the bidder described all services similar to those sought by this RFP that the bidder has provided to other businesses or governmental entities, including all contracts and projects that the bidder currently holds or is working on, with a contact person's name from that business or governmental entity?

Yes

Has the bidder identified if the services were timely provided and within budget?

No - cut costs → Cut costs on many projects.

pg 140 says projects completed timely - no %s.

Bidder must provide letters of reference, with the following information, from up to three (3) business contacts knowledgeable of the bidder's performance as a primary contractor in providing services similar to the services described in the RFP:

- a. Project Title Yes.
- b. Contact organization name
- c. Contact name, title, and current telephone number
- d. Brief description of scope of work that demonstrates relevance to this RFP.

Additional information that may be included: Original project start and end dates and Total project value to the bidder's organization

2. RFP section 4.2.6.2 Personnel

Has the bidder submitted a table of organization that describes the following:

- Company's structure, including lines of authority, names and credentials of the owners and executives of the organization and, if applicable, their roles on this project? Yes.

- Key personnel, including the Project Manager, who will be involved in providing services for this RFP?

Iowa Implementation team =
Pres - Interim Program Dir. + Danita Capps Implementation Coordinator

Are resumes of key personnel submitted that include name, education, and years of experience and employment history, particularly as it relates to the scope of services for this RFP?

Yes.

Has information been submitted on other contracts and projects currently undertaken by the bidder?

pg 155 - amendment to RFP.

3. RFP section 4.2.6.3 Financial Information

Has the bidder provided letters of reference from three (3) banking institutions and/or creditors?

- Do the letters depict the bidder's financial viability and are they indicative of future financial stability?

Yes

- Do the letters provide a contact person and telephone number for each reference?

Yes.

Has the bidder provided the following organizational background information:

- Full name, address, and telephone number;
- Date established;
- Ownership (i.e. public company, partnership, etc.)
- Description of business operations;
- Details of any proposed mergers, acquisitions, or sales that may affect financial stability or organizational structure; and
- A description, if any, of insurance claims filed within the past five (5) years.

Yes.

4. RFP section 4.2.6.4 Termination, Litigation, and Investigation

During the last five (5) years:

Has the bidder had a contract for services terminated for any reason or has any such contract been subject to any form of default notice or threat of termination? **No.**

Has the bidder described any damages or penalties or anything of value traded or given up? **Yes**


Has the bidder listed and summarized pending or threatened litigation, administrative or regulatory proceedings, or similar matters that could affect the ability of the bidder to perform the required services? **pg 160 - says involved in litigation from time to time. Did not release specific info.**

Have any of the owners, officers, or primary partners ever been convicted of a felony? **No**

Have any irregularities been discovered in any of the accounts maintained by the bidder on behalf of others? **No**

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 70%	Total points 35
Evaluator's Signature 		Date 4/26/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.5 Technical Proposal Evaluation Report

The Department is interested in proposals that provide well-organized, all-inclusive, and technically sound business solutions. Ambiguous explanations will challenge the proposer's credibility and will result in a negative impact upon the bidder's evaluation report.

The Technical Proposal Evaluation Team will compile a Technical Proposal Evaluation Report. The Report will contain, at a minimum:

- A tool to record impressions and other comments (such as follow up questions for the evaluation team) developed during the proposal evaluation for each respective bidder.
- Individual bidder score sheets that will include the individual evaluator scores and the final calculated average score for the bidder
- Compilation of bidder average scores for all bidders, including their final Technical Proposal ranking



MTM

- Already mty w/ public transit.
- Rural coverage + work in bordering states.
- Care Mngt Dept
- Option 1 = BO + Call center in DSM
- Option 2 = BO w/in Sm, use existing call center.
- URAC - core standards accreditation
- Prefer 48 hrs notice; will try to accommodate if under 48 hrs.
- Provider Manual - Tab 8 - pg 6 - trips by approved drivers will not be reimbursed.
- Checks mailed twice / mo.
- Weekly reconciliation process.
- pg 58 - Claims Screen Shots
- pg 59 - Ed materials
- Cost mgt / Fraud
- Healthcare & transportation knowledge
- Experience w/ DHS in other states

1.3.4 Review of Proposal Sections

1.3.4.1 Executive Summary

BIDDER:	MTM
EVALUATOR Number:	2

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 4.2.4. Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder clearly demonstrate its strengths and the key features of its proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder presented a comprehensive overview of the services being proposed?

yes

Has the bidder provided a summary of their strengths and identified the key features of their proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

yes

Has the bidder included a summary of its project management plans?

yes

Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 90	Total points 45
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.2 Overall Project Understanding

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	

Evaluation Criteria: (Continuation from RFP Section 4.2.4 Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate in its own words, a clear understanding of the Department's needs?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements in the RFP?

yes

Has the bidder described how they will adjust to accommodate program changes?

yes

Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 90	Total points 45
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.3 General Requirements

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 3.2.1 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Consider the bidder's approach to internal quality assurance.

Consider the bidder's description of their NEMT tracking database.

Consider the bidder's description of their electronic billing and invoice system.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder explained their approach to Section 3.2.1 General Requirements and identified each requirement and addressed each requirement?

yes

Has the bidder satisfactorily described their approach to and scope of their internal quality assurance activities?

yes

Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 90	Total points 45
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.4 Contractor Responsibilities

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate that it has the capability to perform the service requirements?

Consider: The bidder's approach to establishment of a call center and a central business office location?

Consider: The broker's approach to development of a Network plan.

1. RFP section 3.3.2.1 NEMT: Network Providers and Individuals

Has the bidder provided a description of how they will manage the different aspects of the brokerage? *?*

Has the bidder provided the detail describing the level of staff for the Account Manager position, and the call center positions, and do the levels meet the requirements for the brokerage?

yes

Has the bidder described how they will make the transportation arrangements for all Medicaid Members who qualify for NEMT services?

yes

Has the bidder described how they will ensure the provision of necessary NEMT services by establishing a network of providers through the use of subcontracts?

yes

Has the bidder described how they will coordinate requests and make decisions on who provides the transportation when Medicaid Members request that someone, other than a Network provider, transport them?

yes

2. RFP section 3.3.2.2 Verification of Member Eligibility

Has the bidder described their process for verifying the Medicaid Member's eligibility for NEMT services?

yes

3. RFP section 3.3.2.3 Office/Telephone Call Center and Appointments Standards

Has the bidder described their staffing plan for the call center?

yes

Has the bidder described how the call center will operate?

yes

Has the bidder explained their plan to accommodate passengers who have disabilities or special health care needs?

yes.

Does the bidder explain its process to insure that a Member's pick up wait time is according to the requirements specified in the RFP?

yes

4. RFP section 3.3.2.4 NEMT Reimbursement

Has the bidder explained its NEMT reimbursement process?

yes.

5. RFP section 3.3.2.5 Member Education

Has the bidder explained their process for issuing updates to information provided to Members?

yes

6. RFP section 3.3.2.6 Grievance, Complaints and State Fair Hearings System

Has the bidder described their process for providing Members a grievance and complaints process?

yes

Has the bidder explained its notice of the right to a Fair Hearing for Members and their role in representing the Department in the hearing?

yes.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 80	Total points 320
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.5 Corporate/Team Experience & Qualifications

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	

Evaluation Criteria: (RFP Section 4.2.6 Tab 6)

Consider: The organization experience with similar projects

Consider: Executive level commitment and a demonstration of their commitment in previous projects

1. RFP section 4.2.6.1 Experience

Has the bidder described all services similar to those sought by this RFP that the bidder has provided to other businesses or governmental entities, including all contracts and projects that the bidder currently holds or is working on, with a contact person's name from that business or governmental entity? *yes*

Has the bidder identified if the services were timely provided and within budget?

yes.

Bidder must provide letters of reference, with the following information, from up to three (3) business contacts knowledgeable of the bidder's performance as a primary contractor in providing services similar to the services described in the RFP:

- Project Title
- Contact organization name
- Contact name, title, and current telephone number
- Brief description of scope of work that demonstrates relevance to this RFP.

Additional information that may be included: Original project start and end dates and Total project value to the bidder's organization

2. RFP section 4.2.6.2 Personnel

Has the bidder submitted a table of organization that describes the following:

- Company's structure, including lines of authority, names and credentials of the owners and executives of the organization and, if applicable, their roles on this project?
- Key personnel, including the Project Manager, who will be involved in providing services for this RFP?

Are resumes of key personnel submitted that include name, education, and years of experience and employment history, particularly as it relates to the scope of services for this RFP?

Has information been submitted on other contracts and projects currently undertaken by the bidder?

3. RFP section 4.2.6.3 Financial Information

Has the bidder provided letters of reference from three (3) banking institutions and/or creditors?

- Do the letters depict the bidder's financial viability and are they indicative of future financial stability?
- Do the letters provide a contact person and telephone number for each reference?

Has the bidder provided the following organizational background information:

- Full name, address, and telephone number;
- Date established;
- Ownership (i.e. public company, partnership, etc.)
- Description of business operations;
- Details of any proposed mergers, acquisitions, or sales that may affect financial stability or organizational structure; and
- A description, if any, of insurance claims filed within the past five (5) years.

4. RFP section 4.2.6.4 Termination, Litigation, and Investigation

During the last five (5) years:

Has the bidder had a contract for services terminated for any reason or has any such contract been subject to any form of default notice or threat of termination?

Has the bidder described any damages or penalties or anything of value traded or given up?

Has the bidder listed and summarized pending or threatened litigation, administrative or regulatory proceedings, or similar matters that could affect the ability of the bidder to perform the required services?

Have any of the owners, officers, or primary partners ever been convicted of a felony?

Have any irregularities been discovered in any of the accounts maintained by the bidder on behalf of others?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

- Met w/ Local providers
 - Many years in business (15 yrs.)
 - Renewal of contracts.
 - midwest background.
- wide spread pg. 127.

Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 95	Total points 47.50
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4 Review of Proposal Sections

1.3.4.1 Executive Summary

BIDDER:	MTM St Louis, Mo
EVALUATOR Number:	3

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 4.2.4. Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder clearly demonstrate its strengths and the key features of its proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Evaluator Notes Summary: Attendance verif form Series 29 states & DC.
(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder presented a comprehensive overview of the services being proposed?

Yes, attendance verif form, education,

Has the bidder provided a summary of their strengths and identified the key features of their proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Yes - Care Mgmt dept, upholding eligibility

Has the bidder included a summary of its project management plans?

Yes, experienced team, 2 options for bus office/call center close to home (St. Louis, Mo)

Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points 50
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/24/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.2 Overall Project Understanding

BIDDER:	MTM
EVALUATOR Number:	3

Evaluation Criteria: (Continuation from RFP Section 4.2.4 Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate in its own words, a clear understanding of the Department's needs?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements in the RFP?

Yes, seems to understand all the necessary requirements

Has the bidder described how they will adjust to accommodate program changes?

extensive training for all stakeholders involved

Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points 50
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/30/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.3 General Requirements

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	3

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 3.2.1 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Consider the bidder's approach to internal quality assurance.

Consider the bidder's description of their NEMT tracking database.

Consider the bidder's description of their electronic billing and invoice system.

Evaluator Notes Summary: Appendix 12 - "What if I call with less than 3 bus days' notice?"
 (Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)
 ? ancillary services - not sure about those pg. 38
 Has the bidder explained their approach to Section 3.2.1 General Requirements and identified each requirement and addressed each requirement?

3 legs? pg. 35

Has the bidder satisfactorily described their approach to and scope of their internal quality assurance activities?

I. pg. 42 - Dept. has dedicated Compliance Auditor

Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points 30
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/27/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.4 Contractor Responsibilities

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	3

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate that it has the capability to perform the service requirements?

Consider: The bidder's approach to establishment of a call center and a central business office location?

Consider: The broker's approach to development of a Network plan.

1. RFP section 3.3.2.1 NEMT: Network Providers and Individuals

Has the bidder provided a description of how they will manage the different aspects of the brokerage?

Yes - computer, providers, CSRs, etc.
Quality assurance.

Has the bidder provided the detail describing the level of staff for the Account Manager position, and the call center positions, and do the levels meet the requirements for the brokerage?

19 CSRs & 2 Lead workers

Has the bidder described how they will make the transportation arrangements for all Medicaid Members who qualify for NEMT services?

Yes -

Has the bidder described how they will ensure the provision of necessary NEMT services by establishing a network of providers through the use of subcontracts?

Yes - they call it provider panel

Has the bidder described how they will coordinate requests and make decisions on who provides the transportation when Medicaid Members request that someone, other than a Network provider, transport them?

Will use volunteers, friends, family, etc.
Wants to increase amount of per mile rate for transportation for mileage reimbursement

2. RFP section 3.3.2.2 Verification of Member Eligibility

Has the bidder described their process for verifying the Medicaid Member's eligibility for NEMT services? Yes, their system will interface with MMS.

Also, manual capabilities exist for inputting eligibility using ELVES.

3. RFP section 3.3.2.3 Office/Telephone Call Center and Appointments Standards

Has the bidder described their staffing plan for the call center?

19 CSRs & 2 Team Leads.

Has the bidder described how the call center will operate?

Yes - 8-5 M-F. After hours calls to Customer Service Center in Mo.

Has the bidder explained their plan to accommodate passengers who have disabilities or special health care needs?

LOI - level-of-need assessment
mode of transport will be suited to Members needs.

Does the bidder explain its process to insure that a Member's pick up wait time is according to the requirements specified in the RFP?

Written into service agreement & daily log (trip sheet)
attests to it by driver & Member.

4. RFP section 3.3.2.4 NEMT Reimbursement

Has the bidder explained its NEMT reimbursement process?

Flow chart B112

5. RFP section 3.3.2.5 Member Education

Has the bidder explained their process for issuing updates to information provided to Members?

Yes, member letter, brochure, or info on website

6. RFP section 3.3.2.6 Grievance, Complaints and State Fair Hearings System

Has the bidder described their process for providing Members a grievance and complaints process?

Yes - pg. 121

Has the bidder explained its notice of the right to a Fair Hearing for Members and their role in representing the Department in the hearing?

Yes, pg. 123

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points 390
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.5 Corporate/Team Experience & Qualifications

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	

Evaluation Criteria: (RFP Section 4.2.6 Tab 6)

Consider: The organization experience with similar projects

Consider: Executive level commitment and a demonstration of their commitment in previous projects

1. RFP section 4.2.6.1 Experience

Has the bidder described all services similar to those sought by this RFP that the bidder has provided to other businesses or governmental entities, including all contracts and projects that the bidder currently holds or is working on, with a contact person's name from that business or governmental entity?

Yes - pgs. 126 - 139

Has the bidder identified if the services were timely provided and within budget?

Yes pg 140

Bidder must provide letters of reference, with the following information, from up to three (3) business contacts knowledgeable of the bidder's performance as a primary contractor in providing services similar to the services described in the RFP:

- Project Title
- Contact organization name
- Contact name, title, and current telephone number
- Brief description of scope of work that demonstrates relevance to this RFP.

YES

Additional information that may be included: Original project start and end dates and Total project value to the bidder's organization

2. RFP section 4.2.6.2 Personnel

Has the bidder submitted a table of organization that describes the following:

- Company's structure, including lines of authority, names and credentials of the owners and executives of the organization and, if applicable, their roles on this project? *Yes*
- Key personnel, including the Project Manager, who will be involved in providing services for this RFP? *Yes*

Are resumes of key personnel submitted that include name, education, and years of experience and employment history, particularly as it relates to the scope of services for this RFP?

Yes

Has information been submitted on other contracts and projects currently undertaken by the bidder?

Yes pg. 10 Executive Summary

3. RFP section 4.2.6.3 Financial Information

Has the bidder provided letters of reference from three (3) banking institutions and/or creditors?

- Do the letters depict the bidder's financial viability and are they indicative of future financial stability? *Looks like it*
- Do the letters provide a contact person and telephone number for each reference? *Yes.*

Has the bidder provided the following organizational background information:

- Full name, address, and telephone number;
- Date established;
- Ownership (i.e. public company, partnership, etc.)
- Description of business operations;
- Details of any proposed mergers, acquisitions, or sales that may affect financial stability or organizational structure; and
- A description, if any, of insurance claims filed within the past five (5) years.

4. RFP section 4.2.6.4 Termination, Litigation, and Investigation

During the last five (5) years:

Has the bidder had a contract for services terminated for any reason or has any such contract been subject to any form of default notice or threat of termination?

No

Has the bidder described any damages or penalties or anything of value traded or given up?

pg. 159

Has the bidder listed and summarized pending or threatened litigation, administrative or regulatory proceedings, or similar matters that could affect the ability of the bidder to perform the required services?

No - doesn't appear to be of any impact.

Have any of the owners, officers, or primary partners ever been convicted of a felony?

no convictions

Have any irregularities been discovered in any of the accounts maintained by the bidder on behalf of others?

No irregularities

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points <i>50</i>
Evaluator's Signature		Date <i>4/30/10</i>
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

recent implementation in Kansas pg 14

Executive Summary

Upholding eligibility - pg. 11

Eliminating fraud & abuse - " "

Core Management Dept - extra concept pg 14.

X MTM best practice is 5 days scheduling for appts especially in rural areas.

1.3.4 Review of Proposal Sections

1.3.4.1 Executive Summary

BIDDER:	MTM
EVALUATOR Number:	4

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 4.2.4. Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder clearly demonstrate its strengths and the key features of its proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder presented a comprehensive overview of the services being proposed?

Yes - Addressed our points of concern in the exec summary

Has the bidder provided a summary of their strengths and identified the key features of their proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

yes

Has the bidder included a summary of its project management plans?

Not in exec summary Implied throughout summary

Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points 45
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/28/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.2 Overall Project Understanding

BIDDER:	MTP
EVALUATOR Number:	4

Evaluation Criteria: (Continuation from RFP Section 4.2.4 Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate in its own words, a clear understanding of the Department's needs?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements in the RFP?

Yes - listed - Social / Comm w Public Transit, bus networks, etc - many

Has the bidder described how they will adjust to accommodate program changes?

Addressed in the Summary & Action plan

Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points 50
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/28/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.3 General Requirements

BIDDER:	MTM
EVALUATOR Number:	4

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 3.2.1 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Consider the bidder's approach to internal quality assurance.

Consider the bidder's description of their NEMT tracking database.

Consider the bidder's description of their electronic billing and invoice system.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder explained their approach to Section 3.2.1 General Requirements and identified each requirement and addressed each requirement?

QA - yes - assigned internal audits p. 27
 Tracking - yes - use NEMT Management for Tracking Orders + airplanes
 Billing - Yes web portals which allow Paper Billing

Has the bidder satisfactorily described their approach to and scope of their internal quality assurance activities?

yes - Described pages 24 → 30
 Rely on Customer Surveys + Audits + QA committee

Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points 50
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/28
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.4 Contractor Responsibilities

BIDDER:	M/M
EVALUATOR Number:	4

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate that it has the capability to perform the service requirements?

Consider: The bidder's approach to establishment of a call center and a central business office location?

Consider: The broker's approach to development of a Network plan.

1. RFP section 3.3.2.1 NEMT: Network Providers and Individuals

Has the bidder provided a description of how they will manage the different aspects of the brokerage?

yes Described pgs 6

Has the bidder provided the detail describing the level of staff for the Account Manager position, and the call center positions, and do the levels meet the requirements for the brokerage?

yes Attachment 1 Also

Pgs 56-57 proposed 2 nation. call center

Has the bidder described how they will make the transportation arrangements for all Medicaid Members who qualify for NEMT services?

yes - flow chart pg 47

Has the bidder described how they will ensure the provision of necessary NEMT services by establishing a network of providers through the use of subcontracts?

yes

Has the bidder described how they will coordinate requests and make decisions on who provides the transportation when Medicaid Members request that someone, other than a Network provider, transport them?

could not find

2. RFP section 3.3.2.2 Verification of Member Eligibility

Has the bidder described their process for verifying the Medicaid Member's eligibility for NEMT services?

yes pg 88

3. RFP section 3.3.2.3 Office/Telephone Call Center and Appointments Standards

Has the bidder described their staffing plan for the call center?

*yes Two options - National Call Center of IA only call
23 staff*

Has the bidder described how the call center will operate?

yes

Has the bidder explained their plan to accommodate passengers who have disabilities or special health care needs?

Pg 100 - Level of need process

Does the bidder explain its process to insure that a Member's pick up wait time is according to the requirements specified in the RFP?

yes. System to Monitor + Measure call

4. RFP section 3.3.2.4 NEMT Reimbursement

Has the bidder explained its NEMT reimbursement process?

yes pg 111 → 112

5. RFP section 3.3.2.5 Member Education

Has the bidder explained their process for issuing updates to information provided to Members?

*Yes P3 60
1. brochures to send
2. can be made*

6. RFP section 3.3.2.6 Grievance, Complaints and State Fair Hearings System

Has the bidder described their process for providing Members a grievance and complaints process?

Yes

Has the bidder explained its notice of the right to a Fair Hearing for Members and their role in representing the Department in the hearing?

Yes detailed on 120 → 124

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points 396
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/25/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points 400
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/30/09
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.5 Corporate/Team Experience & Qualifications

BIDDER:	MTM
EVALUATOR Number:	4

Evaluation Criteria: (RFP Section 4.2.6 Tab 6)

Consider: The organization experience with similar projects

Consider: Executive level commitment and a demonstration of their commitment in previous projects

1. RFP section 4.2.6.1 Experience

Has the bidder described all services similar to those sought by this RFP that the bidder has provided to other businesses or governmental entities, including all contracts and projects that the bidder currently holds or is working on, with a contact person's name from that business or governmental entity?

Yes & states described

Has the bidder identified if the services were timely provided and within budget?

Included Satisfaction rates

Bidder must provide letters of reference, with the following information, from up to three (3) business contacts knowledgeable of the bidder's performance as a primary contractor in providing services similar to the services described in the RFP:

- a. Project Title Yes Yes Yes
- b. Contact organization name Yes Yes Yes
- c. Contact name, title, and current telephone number Yes Yes Yes
- d. Brief description of scope of work that demonstrates relevance to this RFP. Yes Yes Yes

Additional information that may be included: Original project start and end dates and Total project value to the bidder's organization

2. RFP section 4.2.6.2 Personnel

Has the bidder submitted a table of organization that describes the following:

- Company's structure, including lines of authority, names and credentials of the owners and executives of the organization and, if applicable, their roles on this project? *Pg 142 T2*

- Key personnel, including the Project Manager, who will be involved in providing services for this RFP?

yes - Heather Kopp

Are resumes of key personnel submitted that include name, education, and years of experience and employment history, particularly as it relates to the scope of services for this RFP?

*Experiences detailed in * References given in Corp Org*

Has information been submitted on other contracts and projects currently undertaken by the bidder?

Yes

3. RFP section 4.2.6.3 Financial Information

Has the bidder provided letters of reference from three (3) banking institutions and/or creditors?

- Do the letters depict the bidder's financial viability and are they indicative of future financial stability? *Yes*
- Do the letters provide a contact person and telephone number for each reference? *Yes*

Has the bidder provided the following organizational background information:

- Full name, address, and telephone number; *Yes*
- Date established; *Yes*
- Ownership (i.e. public company, partnership, etc.) *Yes*
- Description of business operations; *Yes*
- Details of any proposed mergers, acquisitions, or sales that may affect financial stability or organizational structure; and *Yes*
- A description, if any, of insurance claims filed within the past five (5) years.

Yes

4. RFP section 4.2.6.4 Termination, Litigation, and Investigation

During the last five (5) years:

Has the bidder had a contract for services terminated for any reason or has any such contract been subject to any form of default notice or threat of termination? *No*

Has the bidder described any damages or penalties or anything of value traded or given up? *Problem w/ Missouri contract extension*

Has the bidder listed and summarized pending or threatened litigation, administrative or regulatory proceedings, or similar matters that could affect the ability of the bidder to perform the required services? *Nothing out of Racine as a transportation company*

Have any of the owners, officers, or primary partners ever been convicted of a felony?

Have any irregularities been discovered in any of the accounts maintained by the bidder on behalf of others? *Not state*
NP

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points 50
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.5 Technical Proposal Evaluation Report

The Department is interested in proposals that provide well-organized, all-inclusive, and technically sound business solutions. Ambiguous explanations will challenge the proposer's credibility and will result in a negative impact upon the bidder's evaluation report.

The Technical Proposal Evaluation Team will compile a Technical Proposal Evaluation Report. The Report will contain, at a minimum:

- A tool to record impressions and other comments (such as follow up questions for the evaluation team) developed during the proposal evaluation for each respective bidder.
- Individual bidder score sheets that will include the individual evaluator scores and the final calculated average score for the bidder
- Compilation of bidder average scores for all bidders, including their final Technical Proposal ranking

1.3.4 Review of Proposal Sections

1.3.4.1 Executive Summary

BIDDER:	MTM
EVALUATOR Number:	5

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 4.2.4. Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder clearly demonstrate its strengths and the key features of its proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder presented a comprehensive overview of the services being proposed?

Yes

Has the bidder provided a summary of their strengths and identified the key features of their proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Yes

Has the bidder included a summary of its project management plans?

Yes

Iowa
positions
28 w/call
center
7 w/o

Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 80	Total points 40
Evaluator's Signature	Date 4/23/10	
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature	Date	
RFP Project Director Signature	Date	

1.3.4.2 Overall Project Understanding

BIDDER:	MTM
EVALUATOR Number:	5

Evaluation Criteria: (Continuation from RFP Section 4.2.4 Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate in its own words, a clear understanding of the Department's needs?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements in the RFP?

Yes

Has the bidder described how they will adjust to accommodate program changes?

Yes

Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 80	Total points 40
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/23
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.3 General Requirements

BIDDER:	MTM
EVALUATOR Number:	5

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 3.2.1 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Consider the bidder's approach to internal quality assurance.

Consider the bidder's description of their NEMT tracking database.

Consider the bidder's description of their electronic billing and invoice system.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder explained their approach to Section 3.2.1 General Requirements and identified each requirement and addressed each requirement?

Yes

Has the bidder satisfactorily described their approach to and scope of their internal quality assurance activities?

Yes extensive reporting

Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 80	Total points 40
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.4 Contractor Responsibilities

BIDDER:	MTM
EVALUATOR Number:	5

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate that it has the capability to perform the service requirements?

Consider: The bidder's approach to establishment of a call center and a central business office location?

Consider: The broker's approach to development of a Network plan.

1. RFP section 3.3.2.1 NEMT: Network Providers and Individuals

Has the bidder provided a description of how they will manage the different aspects of the brokerage?

Actual possible locations for DSM office IDed

Has the bidder provided the detail describing the level of staff for the Account Manager position, and the call center positions, and do the levels meet the requirements for the brokerage?

Call center options local or out-of-state

Has the bidder described how they will make the transportation arrangements for all Medicaid Members who qualify for NEMT services?

Yes

Has the bidder described how they will ensure the provision of necessary NEMT services by establishing a network of providers through the use of subcontracts?

Yes backed up by direct operation option

Has the bidder described how they will coordinate requests and make decisions on who provides the transportation when Medicaid Members request that someone, other than a Network provider, transport them?

? preferred mode based on cost
but only if person says they
can't afford it themselves

2. RFP section 3.3.2.2 Verification of Member Eligibility

Has the bidder described their process for verifying the Medicaid Member's eligibility for NEMT services?

Yes

3. RFP section 3.3.2.3 Office/Telephone Call Center and Appointments Standards

Has the bidder described their staffing plan for the call center?

Yes

19 CRS + 2 ^{team} lead

Has the bidder described how the call center will operate?

Yes

Has the bidder explained their plan to accommodate passengers who have disabilities or special health care needs?

?

Does the bidder explain its process to insure that a Member's pick up wait time is according to the requirements specified in the RFP?

Yes

4. RFP section 3.3.2.4 NEMT Reimbursement

Has the bidder explained its NEMT reimbursement process?

Yes

5. RFP section 3.3.2.5 Member Education

Has the bidder explained their process for issuing updates to information provided to Members?

Listed possible Modes

6. RFP section 3.3.2.6 Grievance, Complaints and State Fair Hearings System

Has the bidder described their process for providing Members a grievance and complaints process?

Yes

Has the bidder explained its notice of the right to a Fair Hearing for Members and their role in representing the Department in the hearing?

listed who will ~~assist~~ be involved

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 85	Total points 340
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/23
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.5 Corporate/Team Experience & Qualifications

BIDDER:	MTM
EVALUATOR Number:	5

Evaluation Criteria: (RFP Section 4.2.6 Tab 6)

Consider: The organization experience with similar projects

Consider: Executive level commitment and a demonstration of their commitment in previous projects

1. RFP section 4.2.6.1 Experience

Has the bidder described all services similar to those sought by this RFP that the bidder has provided to other businesses or governmental entities, including all contracts and projects that the bidder currently holds or is working on, with a contact person's name from that business or governmental entity?

Yes good comparability

Has the bidder identified if the services were timely provided and within budget?

Yes

Bidder must provide letters of reference, with the following information, from up to three (3) business contacts knowledgeable of the bidder's performance as a primary contractor in providing services similar to the services described in the RFP:

- Project Title
- Contact organization name
- Contact name, title, and current telephone number
- Brief description of scope of work that demonstrates relevance to this RFP.

Yes

Additional information that may be included: Original project start and end dates and Total project value to the bidder's organization

2. RFP section 4.2.6.2 Personnel

Has the bidder submitted a table of organization that describes the following:

- Company's structure, including lines of authority, names and credentials of the owners and executives of the organization and, if applicable, their roles on this project?

Yes

- Key personnel, including the Project Manager, who will be involved in providing services for this RFP?

Project manager not named

Are resumes of key personnel submitted that include name, education, and years of experience and employment history, particularly as it relates to the scope of services for this RFP?

Yes No Iowa staff IDed

~~Has information been submitted on other contracts and projects currently undertaken by the bidder?~~

3. RFP section 4.2.6.3 Financial Information

Has the bidder provided letters of reference from three (3) banking institutions and/or creditors?

- Do the letters depict the bidder's financial viability and are they indicative of future financial stability?

Yes

- Do the letters provide a contact person and telephone number for each reference?

Yes

Has the bidder provided the following organizational background information:

- Full name, address, and telephone number;
- Date established;
- Ownership (i.e. public company, partnership, etc.)
- Description of business operations;
- Details of any proposed mergers, acquisitions, or sales that may affect financial stability or organizational structure; and
- A description, if any, of insurance claims filed within the past five (5) years.

General Summary

4. RFP section 4.2.6.4 Termination, Litigation, and Investigation

During the last five (5) years:

Has the bidder had a contract for services terminated for any reason or has any such contract been subject to any form of default notice or threat of termination?

None other than expiration
Has the bidder described any damages or penalties or anything of value traded or given up?

Missouri no-fault settlement

Has the bidder listed and summarized pending or threatened litigation, administrative or regulatory proceedings, or similar matters that could affect the ability of the bidder to perform the required services? *Summary statement*

Have any of the owners, officers, or primary partners ever been convicted of a felony?

No
Have any irregularities been discovered in any of the accounts maintained by the bidder on behalf of others?

No

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% <i>75</i>	Total points <i>37 1/2</i>
Evaluator's Signature		Date <i>4/23/10</i>
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date